

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE CANON CAMERAS LITIGATION

This document relates to:

## All Actions

JOSEPH ANASTASIO, JULIA ILYUTOVICH, :  
TYLER MASTERSON, EMILY ROSENBERG, and :  
BRIAN RUARK, individually and on :  
behalf of all others similarly :  
situated, :

Plaintiffs,

- v -

CANON U.S.A., INC. and CANON, INC.,

Defendants.

05 Civ. 7233 (JSR)

06 Civ. 4024 (JSR)

ORDER

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #:  
DATE FILED: 6-2-06

JED S. RAKOFF, U.S.D.J.

On the consent of the parties, the following named plaintiffs in In re Canon Cameras, 05 Civ 7233 (JSR), are hereby dismissed with prejudice: Ajaya Agrawalla, David Hyman, Albert Khaydatov, Sharon Larsen, David Nugent, and Ronald Richter.

Further, for the reasons stated from the bench, see transcript, 5/30/06, the application to consolidate the newly-filed Anastasio et al. v. Canon U.S.A., Inc. et al., 06 Civ. 4024 (JSR), with In re Canon Cameras, 05 Civ 7233 (JSR), is hereby denied. Further, Anastasio et al. v. Canon U.S.A., Inc. et al., 06 Civ. 4024 (JSR) is hereby stayed in all respects and placed on the Court's suspense calendar until further order of the Court. There shall be

no discovery in 06 Civ 4024, and no motions shall be filed by any party, without the prior, express, written approval of the Court.

The Clerk of the Court is hereby directed to unfile the class certification motion recently filed in the above-captioned matters as improperly filed, and plaintiffs have until June 2, 2006 at 5 p.m. to re-file moving papers on their class certification motion in In re Canon Cameras, 05 Civ. 7233 (JSR). The remainder of the briefing schedule on the motion for class certification is adjusted as follows: answering papers to be filed and served by July 5, 2006; reply by July 10, 2006, and oral argument to be held on July 17, 2006 at 4 p.m.

Finally, as to the issue of service on Canon, Inc. in the newly-filed Anastasio et al. v. Canon U.S.A., Inc., 06 Civ. 4204 (JSR), the Court will hold an evidentiary hearing, not on the merits of service per se, but solely for the purpose of determining whether any conduct of counsel requires referral to the Grievance Committee for the Southern District of New York. Counsel are directed to determine two possible dates when that hearing may be scheduled and to jointly call Chambers with their proposed dates.

SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JED S. RAKOFF, U.S.D.J.

Dated: New York, New York  
May 30, 2006